

Serial No.

## REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of May 16, 2008 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 11-20 have been examined. These have been rejected as follows: claim 20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite because "the at least one groove" in claim 20, line 7 lacks antecedent basis; claims 11, 12, 14-16, 18 and 20 under 35 USC 102(b) by Frey et al.; and claims 13, 17 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) by Grey et al. in view of Schmoock.

Claim 20 has been amended to insert the necessary antecedent basis, thereby overcoming the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Before considering the art rejections consideration will be given to the examiner's comments regarding an IDS. It is noted that the IDS did not only cite the German Search Report. It also listed and provided copies of the references cited. The only cited references without at least an English abstract are the two DE references. Abstracts of these references will be filed shortly.

\*\*\*\*\*

Regarding the Frey et al publication, the examiner refers to the expansion portions 111 and 112 as "at least one groove." The "at least one groove" recited in claim 11 is not readable on expansion portions 111 and 112 of Frey et al. The "at least one groove" of the present invention refers to groove 115 or groove 116 (the additional groove recited in claim 15).

As discussed in the specification of the present application these expansion portions of Frey et al fail to sufficiently lessen the tendency of the liner and/or the support skeleton to crack and also fail in preventing the support skeleton to twist or shift (due to sintering). Hence the subject matter, a groove formed in the wall of the carrier tube which is open toward the lumen of said carrier tube, differs, structurally and functionally from anything disclosed in Frey et al..

The examiner states that Schmoock teaches the use of a backcut in the wall of a tube that is filled with a connecting material. Actually Schmoock shows

Serial No.

how to fasten a metallic insert into a plastic electrode (not in the wall of the tube). The electrode is molded into the teeth of the metallic insert. Schmoock gives no hint for using the backcut to fasten the liner in the carrier tube. Instead a carrier tube with a plain inner wall is shown.

Further, because of the in-situ sintering and the charging of the insulating material into the carrier, the strength-loss temperature of the carrier tube must be greater than that of the support skeleton and that of the support skeleton must be greater than the melting temperature of the liner, see the specification, page 13, line 28 to page 14, line 27. Whereas the melting temperature of the metallic insert is above the one of the plastic electrode.

Although actions have been taken to fasten the skeleton and liner to the carrier tube, it isn't recognized in the cited state of the art, that these actions aren't sufficient to avoid shifting and breaking of the liner and the skeleton. So there's no indication for a person skilled in the art leading to the inventive magneto-inductive flow sensor or at the method for producing the same.


Accordingly, the rejections noted above are respectfully traversed, and claims 11 - 20 should be allowed in their present formulation.

Date: August 18, 2008

BACON & THOMAS  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500

S:\Producer\fjd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\KAPP3001-FL0224\August 18 2008 Response.wpd

Respectfully submitted,



Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
Registration No. 25,721